LIVY'S USE OF *NEQUE* AND *NEVE* WITH AN IMPERATIVE OR SUBJUNCTIVE

By Emory B. Lease

The present investigation has two objects in view, the one syntactic, to discover the principles that determined Livy's use of one of these particles in preference to the other;[1] the other formal, to ascertain to what extent his use of the longer or shorter form of each was in harmony with the general rules[2] governing the use of other particles which likewise appear in a double form, as *atque—ac, neque—nec, sive—seu*, and *deinde—dein.*[3] For convenience, the matter of form will be taken up first.

I. FORMAL

A. HISTORICAL

1. *Prose.*—It may be said in a general way that where particles appear in two forms the shorter put in their appearance later and were not used extensively until a comparatively late period in the development of the language. The first to be considered are *neu* and *seu*, and a tabular form of exposition has been adopted, to exhibit more clearly the facts of their use.

Prose	Sc. de Bacch.	Cato Agr.	Varro R. R.	Lex Bant.	Lex Acil.	Lex Agr.	Lex Munic.	Lex Col. Gen. Iul.	Cic. Or. et Phil.	Caesar	Nepos	Sallust	Livy	Tacitus	Suetonius (Ihm)
Neve ..	14	13	5	13	20	38	44	103	34	8	3	5	32	11	5
Neu ...	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	1	16	44	16	1
Sive ...	0	5	4	2	2	4	5	6	265	27	4	2	61	93	6
Seu ...	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	14	0	4	185	100	9

---

[1] "Wünschenswert wäre eine Untersuchung über den Gebrauch von *neve* im Vergleich mit dem von *neque.*"—Schmalz *Antibarbarus*⁷ II, p. 145.

[2] In this investigation, as in those preceding, the latest Teubner texts were used, and MS variants noted. Owing to the occasional confusion of the forms by the scribes, absolute accuracy cannot of course be claimed for the results. It is maintained, however, that they are sufficiently accurate to show the general rules observed in the use of these particles. The evidence of contemporary inscriptions is of course important, and this will be found to corroborate the statements here made.

[3] For the writer's previous treatment of *atque* and *ac* cf. *Studies in Honor of B. L. Gildersleeve*, pp. 414 f.; of *neque* and *nec, Class. Rev.* XVI (1902), pp. 212 f.; of *deinde* and *dein, Am. Jour. Phil.* XXVIII (1907), pp. 387 f.

Remarks. It is to be noted that: (1) The 5 occurrences of *neu* in Cato *Agr.* are read in two passages. The striking exception to the general rule, therefore, that in prose *neu* was not used until the time of Caesar and Sallust, throws some doubt upon the correctness of the MS tradition in these two passages. (2) With Caesar[1] and particularly Sallust begins a decided break from the earlier usages. In Caesar *neu* reaches as high a proportion as 69.2 per cent., in Sallust even higher, 76.2 per cent. Livy follows with 57.9 per cent., Tacitus with 59.2 per cent. Suetonius (Ihm), however, uses *neu* only once, *Iul.* 42. 1, but *neve* 5 times, Curtius, on the other hand, *neu* 4 times, *neve* not at all.

a) A striking contrast is found between the frequency of *neve* (*neu*) in a legal sphere, as in *Col. Gen. Iul.*[2] 102 times, and its rarity in biography, as in Nepos, 4 times. It is noteworthy also that, whereas this particle was used 76 times by Livy and 27 times by Tacitus, it was not used at all by the Auct. Her. and in only one passage by Seneca (prose), *Ep.* 7. 8, with no variant noted by Hense,[3] and in only two by Justin (R.), 6. 3. 8: 18. 4. 10.

b) Sallust is conspicuous for his fondness for the forms *neu* and *seu*, and Curtius used only the form *neu*, but *sive* 33 times.

c) The history of *seu* presents similar phenomena; its appearance in prose literature begins with 5.7 per cent. in Cicero, rises to 34.1 per cent. in Caesar, 65.7 per cent. in Sallust, and reaches its greatest height in Livy, 75.2 per cent.

d) Both in his use of *neu* and of *seu* Livy follows Sallust rather than Cicero.

e) Cicero objected to the form *neu*, but not to *seu*. The latter form was not used by Auct. Her. also, but *sive* is found 7 times.

f) In the *Lex Rubria*, 49 B. C., neither *neu* nor *seu* nor *nec* was used, but *neve* 4 times and *sive* 3 times, and *neque* 8 times. Later usage may be illustrated by Quintilian, in whom *sive* is

---

[1] For Caesar Kübler's ed. was used, and for Sallust, Eussner's. To Meusel *Lex Caes.* add *B. G.* 1. 26. 6 and *B. C.* 1. 64. 2.

[2] For the inscriptions referred to Schneider's *Dial. Ital. exempla* was used with the exception of the *Lex Munic.*, *Lex Col. Gen. Iul.*, where Kübler *Caes.* III. 2. was consulted.

[3] Ioehring *De Particulis*, p. 51 says (the statement is quoted by Hense to Sen. *Ep.* 123. 7): "*neve* apud Senecam nusquam inveni." In his tragedies, however, this particle is used: *neve Her. Fur.* 655, 681, *Troad.* 553, *Phoen.* 556, *Oed.* 73, *Agam.* 184, *Thyest.* 94, *Oct.* 254, 271; *neu Phaedr.* 1250. *Neve* (*neu*) is, therefore, found 12 times in Seneca!

found 77 times,[1] *seu* 17 times (18 per cent.), by Tacitus, *sive* 99 times, *seu* 104 (51.2 per cent.), and by Suetonius (Ihm), *sive* 6 times, *seu* 9 (60 per cent.). In strong contrast to these stood Seneca *Phil.* (prose), who used *sive* 160 times and *seu* twice, *N. Q.* 2. 59. 3, with no variants noted by Gercke. As Seneca did not use *neu*, the use of *seu* in this one passage may be accounted for by his fondness for variety of expression: *sive . . . . sive . . . . seu . . . . seu.*

With the growth in the use of *neu* and *seu* may be compared that of *ac* and *nec.* The following table shows the growth of *ac* in history.

History	Sallust	Caesar	Nepos	Livy	Velleius	Val. Max.	Curtius	Tacitus	Suetonius
Atque	277	433	69	1,011	58	155	62	312	217
Ac	110	189	42	1,747	122	302	147	893	627

It is a striking fact that there is a nearly regular increase in the use of *ac* from 28.4 per cent. in Sallust to 30.6 per cent. in Caesar, 37.8 per cent. in Nepos, 63.4 per cent. in Livy, 67.7 per cent. in Velleius, 66.1 per cent. in Val. Max., 70.3 per cent. in Curtius, 74.1 per cent. in Tacitus, and 74.3 per cent. in Suetonius. Note the contrast between the 28.4 per cent. in Sallust and 74.3 per cent. in Suetonius.

Similarly *nec* increases from 0.09 per cent. in Sallust (*neque* = 206, *nec* = 2) and 0.06 per cent. in Nepos (*neque* = 155, *nec* = 1) to 8.08 per cent. in Caesar (*neque* = 405, *nec* = 39), to 71.5 per cent. in Livy (first two books of each decade *neque* = 159, *nec* = 398), but to 53.2 per cent. in Tacitus (*neque* = 445, *nec* = 506). In Petronius the proportion reached as high as 77.2 per cent. (*neque* = 49, *nec* = 166).[2] Late Latin usage may be illustrated by Ma-

[1] Bonnell *Lex. Quint.*, s. v. "*sive*," cites only 34 occurrences of *sive* and 4 of *seu*. To *sive (seu)* "simpliciter" add 1. 4. 20; 5. 10. 53; 74; 8 pr. 25, a usage found in all six times.

[2] Varro's usage, however, is exceptional: in *L. L.* and *R. R.* he uses *neque* 205 times, *nec* 77 times (= 27.3 per cent.). Cato *Agr.* used *neque* 28 times, and *nec* twice (6.6 per cent.).

crobius, *Sat.* i, where *nec* reaches as high as 84.2 per cent., and by Augustine *Civ. D.* i, where it reaches 87 per cent.

So also *dein:* contrast 4 per cent. in Cicero, 10 per cent. in Caesar, 15 per cent. in Livy, with 66 per cent. in Tacitus. Livy's usage by decades is as follows:

Decades	*Deinde*	*Dein*
First........	233	30
Third.......	194	54
Fourth......	203	27
41–45........	83	14
Total......	713	125

In contrast to the usage of Tacitus stands Seneca *Phil.*, who did not use *dein* at all in his prose. *Deinde*, on the other hand, is found 170 times in Seneca *Dial.* alone. In Suetonius (Ihm) *deinde* was used 71 times, *dein* 18 times, 20.2 per cent.

2. *Poetry.*—Here metrical considerations had much to do with a more extended use of *neu* than we find in prose.

Poetry	Plautus	Terence	Vergil	Horace	Ovid	Catullus	Tibullus	Propertius	Seneca
Neve	23	2	10	4	70	0	1	7	9
Neu	11	2	21	19	18	3	14	5	1

Poetical usage may, therefore, be illustrated as follows: *neu* is represented by 32.4 per cent. in Plautus, by 50 per cent. in Terence, by 67.7 per cent. in Vergil, by 82.6 per cent. in Horace, by 20.5 per cent. in Ovid, but in Seneca by 10 per cent. Of the elegiac poets, Catullus with *neu* at 100 per cent. and Tibullus at 93.3 per cent. show a contrast to Propertius with *neu* at 41.7 per cent., who in this regard also is more archaic. Catullus uses only *neu*, Tibullus only *seu*, and Propertius has about the same proportion for each, 41.7 per cent. for *neu* and 43.9 per cent. for *seu*.

B. *NEU* AND *SEU* BEFORE A VOWEL

Neu[1] like *ac* and *dein*,[2] like *nec* always in Caesar and generally in Cicero, was avoided before a vowel, as was to be expected from its origin.[3] *Neu* never appears before a vowel in Cato *Agr.* (5),[4] Plautus (11), Terence (2), Sallust (22), Cicero,[5] Caesar (18), Nepos (1), Catullus (3), Tibullus (14), Propertius (5), Ovid (18), Vergil (20), Horace (19), and in Tacitus (31) only once, *Ann.* 15. 63. Livy also paid some attention to this rule; for out of the 44 times that he uses *neu* it occurs only 5 times before a vowel, 3 of these being with a second *neu* before a consonant (8. 32. 15; 25. 7. 4, 38. 5). It is to be noted that *neu* was not used before a vowel after the first decade, except twice in Book xxv.

Seu also was, in the main, subjected to similar restrictions. While *seu* was never used before a vowel by Caesar (14), Catullus (5), Tibullus (20), Propertius (25), Vergil (32), Horace (65), Seneca *Trag.* (11), Tacitus (100), Plin. Min. (21), and only once in Cicero (*Or.* and *Phil.*) (16), in *Verr.* 5. 152, *seu* being used here three times, and only once in Quintilian (16), 7. 2. 48: "*seu* nostra *seu* aliena," and Suetonius (9), Iul. 57 *seu* sol *seu* imber, Livy, on the other hand, used it before a vowel 46 times out of a total 185 times.

C. *NEVE* AND *SIVE* BEFORE A CONSONANT

Judging from the facts revealed by an examination of the latest texts of the writers of the best period, there was considerable variance in the usage of these two forms. *Atque*, it may be noted by way of comparison, in all of the nine historians examined, with the exception of Sallust, showed a decided preference for its use before a vowel.[6] In early times, as indicated by the usage of Cato *Agr.*

---

[1] Kühner *Lat. Gr.* II, p. 656, is to be corrected.

[2] For exceptions to the rule cf. Lease *Am. Jour. Phil.* XXVIII (1907), p. 40, and add Plin. Mai. (M.) 30. 106. *Dein* was also used by Suetonius (Ihm) 18 times, but never before a vowel.

[3] Cf. Niedermann-Hermann *Hist. Laut. des Lat.* (1907), § 32.

[4] The number of times *neu*, in the latter, *seu*, is used before a consonant is placed in parentheses.

[5] Cicero (*Or.* and *Phil.*) uses *neu* but once, *Tusc.* 1. 106, in a poetical passage.

[6] *Atque* before a consonant is represented in Sallust by 57.4 per cent., in Caesar by 13.4 per cent., in Nepos by 19.7 per cent., in Livy, to be specially noted, by 5.4 per cent., in Vell. by 12.1 per cent., Val. Max. by 16.1 per cent., Curtius, 11.3 per cent., Tacitus, 21.2 per cent., and Suetonius, 26.3 per cent.

and Varro *R. R.*, *neve* was used oftener before a consonant than before a vowel, by the former 9 to 4, by the latter 3 to 2. *Neve* before a consonant may, therefore, be said to begin with 69.2 per cent. in Cato, 60 per cent. in Varro, but by the time of Sallust[1] we find this reduced to 40 per cent., in Cicero to 61.5 per cent., and in Caesar to 14.3 per cent. It is to be noted, however, that in two *Senatus-consulta* of the time of Caesar, the *Lex Munic.* and the *Lex. Col. Gen. Iul.*, in each of which *neve* alone is used, in keeping with the preference of the ancient usage for the longer form before a consonant, we find *neve* thus used 70.5 per cent. of the total in the former, and 72.5 per cent. in the latter. In Cicero, also, the earlier usage still prevails, i. e., *neve* is used before a consonant 24 times (= 61.5 per cent.), and 15 times before a vowel. It may be noted that Livy, who in his use of *neu* and *seu* follows Sallust rather than Cicero, by using *neve* 15 times before a consonant (42.8 per cent.), and 20 times before a vowel, in this regard also allies himself with Sallust. The later historians, Tacitus and Suetonius, also follow the earlier usage, as in the former *neve* before a consonant is represented by 66.7 per cent., in the latter by 60 per cent.

In poetry, where metrical convenience must be taken into consideration, we find two schools, the principle of division being the use of *neve* before consonants. The one is represented by Plautus (before consonant 2, vowel 9), Terence (before consonant 0, vowel 2), Vergil (before consonant 3, vowel 7), the other Horace (before consonant 3, vowel 1), Propertius (before consonant 5, vowel 2), and Ovid (before consonant 61, vowel 9). It will be noted that in none of the above is the difference so marked as in Ovid, and that here it is so great as to make it appear to be intentional and not accidental. Furthermore in Seneca *neve* is only used before a consonant.

From the point of view of a decided preference for using *sive* before a consonant, Horace stands out prominent among all the writers examined. This writer uses *sive* in this way 19 times, but only once (*Sat.* 23. 87) before a vowel. With this usage

---

[1] Sallust shows two examples, not one as the *Antibarbarus*[7], *s. v.*, states, *neve nobis Cat.* 33.5 and *neve cum Cat.* 51. 43. The latter is used by Caesar also, *B. G.* 6. 20. 1 (*K*).

compare that of the following writers, where the number of times *sive* is used before a vowel in each is placed first: Caesar 13–14, Cicero (*Or.* and *Phil.*) 120–140, Livy 28–33, Quintilian 44–33, Plin. Min. 12–14, and of the poets Catullus 3–5, Propertius 15–17, Vergil 13–8, and Seneca *Trag.* 4–16.

D. USAGE BEFORE *NON*

Cicero uses *neve* non (*Lael.* 78), *sive* non (*De fato* 28–30, eight times),[1] Livy *neve* non (37. 53. 6), *neque* non[2] (24. 2. 4), but *atque* non, according to Schmalz *Synt.*[3], § 224, is found only in Plin. Maï. In this writer I have noted 18 occurrences of *atque* non. Plaut. *Trin.* 104, however, has *atque non* in G. and Sch.'s edition, as also in Lindsay's. Theoretically, such forms ought not to occur at all. Cf. p. 306 above, n. 3.

II. SYNTACTICAL

In any discussion of the use of the two particles, *neque* and *neve*, the etymology of each should not only serve as the starting-point, but be kept constantly in mind. *Nĕque*, being composed of the old negative particle *nĕ* (cf. *nĕ-fas*, *nĕ-queo*) and the copulative conjunction, *-que*, has a force which may be represented by *et non*. *Nēve*, on the other hand, being composed of the common conjunction *nē* and the disjunctive *-ve* (cf. Sk. *vā*) has a force, which, by way of distinction, may be represented by *et nē* (originally *aut nē*). Accordingly, the fact that *non* is a word negative, *nē* a clause negative, points to the difference between *neque* and *neve*, with the result that the former is conjunctive, the latter disjunctive, and that the former throws the stress of the emphasis upon a single word, the latter upon a clause. It follows also, that, as the particular word to be negatived may be a verb, *nĕque* may be used where we might expect *nēve*, but not *vice versa*. The use of *neque* (=*et non*) with an imperative or subjunctive may be compared with the occasional use of *non* with these moods.

A. CO-ORDINATE CLAUSES

Inasmuch as *nē* is the regular negative of a command both with the imperative and the subjunctive, and as *nĕque* does not contain

---

[1] Cf. also Cic. *De fin.* 2. 41 and *Quint.* 2. 4. 35.

[2] In Varro *L. L.* and *R. R.*, *neque* non is found 4 times, but *nec* non 10 times.

nē, but *nēve* does, the latter is the appropriate negative with these moods, and is particularly effective, owing to the reiteration of the *nē*, in peremptory prohibitions.

In Livy's use of *neque* and *neve* six things are to be noted:

1. *Neque*, rare in Cicero, once in Sallust,[1] and not at all in Caesar, is used by Livy oftener than *neve*, and forms another feature of his poetic style.[2] To Draeger I[2], p. 313, add: Livy 9. 9. 9; 21. 22. 6; 22. 3. 10.

2. *Neque* is used only after an affirmative, *neve* only after a negative, except in 38. 38. 8.

3. *Neque* is used nine times with the subjunctive and only twice with the imperative.

4. *Neque . . . . neque* is found but once; so also *neu . . . . neu.*

5. *Nec* with a deponent is used but once, 5. 53. 3.

Livy's detailed usage is as follows:

a. After a Positive

1. *Neque* with an imperative: used only twice by Livy, and in official documents, 22. 10. 5: "profanum esto *neque* scelus esto," and 38. 38. 8: "elephantos tradito omnis *neque* alios parato."

2. *Neque* (*nec*) with a subjunctive: found 9 times: with an imperfect twice, *neque*, 21. 22. 6 (in O. O.), *nec* 21. 22. 9; with a present and a second *neque* once, 22. 39. 21: "intentus sis *neque*

[1] Cf. *Jug.* 87. 45: "Capessite rem p. . . . . . *neque* quemquam . . . . metus ceperit."

[2] For *neque* with an imperative in poetry cf. Draeger *H. S.* I[2], p. 328, and Blase *H. Gr.* III, p. 246. Each cites but one passage in Martial, 5. 48. 7, but here the latest texts do not have *nec.* This writer shows but 4 examples, 3. 2. 12; 4. 14. 11; 7. 93. 7; 13. 110. 1. To the 8 examples for Ovid cited by Draeger add: *Am.* 1. 8. 63; 2. 2. 26; *A. a.* 2. 335; *Rem. Am.* 221, 222; *Her.* 15. 31; *Tr.* 1. 9. 65; 2. 1. 81; *Met.* 2. 464; 5. 281; 8. 433, 550; 9. 792; 13. 839; *Fast.* 2. 67. 5; 3. 497, 829; 5. 412; 6. 291, 380 (20). All are after a positive exc. *A. a.* 2. 335. Whereas *neque* was used 28 times, *neque* was used only 12 times, all being after a positive exc. *Met.* 10. 352.

For *neque* with a subjunctive, cf. Draeger I[2], p. 313, Blase, p. 198. To Draeger's lists for Plautus add *Bacch.* 847, *Curc.* 27, *Pseud.* 272; for Horace *Ep.* 19. 9 and 11; neither Draeger nor Blase cite any examples from Martial (with pres.=11, with perf.=5), or from Statius. For the former cf. H. S. Lowther *Synt. of Mart.* (Diss. Univ. of Penn., 1906), and for the poets of the Silver Age, W. K. Clement *A.J.P.* XXI (1900), pp. 156 f. Blase cites Ter. *Eun.* 1080, and omits *Eun.* 77; also Prop. 1. 9. 25; Pers. 1. 7; 3. 73. To Draeger I, p. 313, add for Ovid: *Am.* 1. 8. 65; *A. a.* 1. 75, 135, 516, 584; 2. 111, 333; 3. 285; *Rem.* 628; *Met.* 2. 129; 8. 792; 9. 698; 13. 139, 756; 15. 18, 175; *Ibis* 273, 301, 559, 618, 627; *Pont.* 1. 4. 5; 2. 6. 14; 3. 6. 13; *F.* 1. 688, 692; 4. 63, 100, 757; 6. 778 (31). *Neve* at the beginning of a period, according to Draeger II[2], p. 695, found only in Ovid, is much more common in that writer than one would infer from his list of six occurrences. As a matter of fact this usage is found at least 36 times.

. . . . desis *neque* . . . . des," i. e. "and neither . . . . nor;" with a perfect, however, 5 times, once to introduce a parenthesis, "ego contra . . . . *nec* id mirati sitis," and 3 times to begin a sentence: "*Nec* . . . . quaesiverit," 9. 9.11; "*Nec* . . . . existimaritis," 21. 43. 11; "*Nec* . . . . egeritis" 23. 3. 3; once after a present subj., 22. 3. 10: "Hannibal . . . . perveniat *nec* . . . . nos hinc moverimus." Note the original parataxis in 44. 36. 11: "se suadere, adgrediatur *nec* amittat." (In 21. 41. 16 *nec* goes with the following *solum*.)

3. *Neve*, found only once, but in a passage containing a gap in the MSS, 38. 38. 8: "tradito . . . . *neu* plures . . . . *neve* plures . . . . habeto *neve* monerem (habeto)," i. e. "and neither . . . . nor and . . . . not."

b. *After a Negative*

Only *ne* . . . . *neve* used, and 9 times, once with a perfect subj., 22. 10. 5: "*ne* . . . . esto *neve* . . . . cleptum erit" (ancient formula), and 8 times with an imperative, all being in two official documents, 38. 11. 2, 6, 7; 38. 38. 2, 3, 6, 9, 15.

Note also 38. 38. 2: "ne quem . . . . transire sinito *neu* commeatu *neu* qua alia ope iuvato," i. e., "and neither . . . . nor." Cf. also B. 3. *infra*.

B. SUBORDINATE CLAUSES

In final clauses *neve* is the appropriate particle to be used whenever a choice of alternatives is to be given. Where, however, the second clause is added as a continuance to the first clause, we should expect *et nē*, and failing that, *nĕque*, though inaccurate, would have to serve. This usage of *ut* . . . . *neque* is rare, but common in the consecutive sentence, where *ut* . . . . *neque* = *ut* . . . . *et ut nĕ* = *ut* . . . . *et ut non*. In a final sense Sallust uses *ut* . . . . *neque* not at all; Cicero (*Or.* and *Phil.*) 25 times as a consecutive, and 6 times[1] as a final (19.4

[1] *Ut* . . . . *neque* final: Cicero *Verr.* 2. 41: "eum commonefacit *ut* . . . . utatur . . . . *nec* cogat;" 3. 18: "postularunt *ut* . . . . adderent *neque* recederent;" 3. 115: (postularunt) *ut* . . . . praetermittam *neque* eos appellem;" *Off.* 2. 73: "videndum erit ei *ut* . . . . teneat *neque* . . . . fiat;" *Div. Caec.* 52: "suadebit tibi *ut* . . . . discedas *neque* respondeas;" *De or.* 1. 19: "hortemur *ut* . . . . complectantur *neque* . . . . confidant." Caesar *B. G.* 2. 10. 5: "persuaderi *ut* . . . . morarentur *neque* . . . . ferrent;" *B. C.* 3. 92. 2: "praedixerat *ut* . . . . exciperent *neque* . . . . moverent."

per cent.); Caesar 11 times consecutive, twice final (15.4 per cent.); Nepos 7 times only as consecutive, but Livy 9 times consecutive and 16 times final (64 per cent.). It may be noted that in final clauses while Sallust uses *ut . . . . neve* 8 times and *ut . . . . neque* once, and Caesar *ut . . . . neve* 9 times, *ut . . . . neque* twice, Cicero and Livy use each combination almost the same number of times, 4[1]–6 by the former, 14–16 by the latter. In Caesar *ut . . . . neque* is always used with two verbs; in Cicero always, except *Verr.* 3. 227; 4. 45; *Tusc.* 5. 13; and in Livy always, except 3. 58. 5.

1. *Ut . . . . neve,*[2] the normal form of the final clause, in Livy always with two verbs: *ut . . . . neve* (twice in Caesar *B. G.* 6. 20. 1; *B. C.* 3. 103. 4): 2. 32. 2; 4. 14. 5; 25. 28. 4; 26. 34. 7 (=4), but more commonly *ut . . . . neu,* as in Caesar (7): 2. 15. 2; 3. 44. 12; 8. 30. 2; 32. 12; 24. 30. 14; 25. 1. 12; 29. 2. 13; 32. 22. 6; 33. 46. 7; 39. 19. 4 (=10). Note also the parataxis in 3. 55. 6; 28. 36. 2; 34. 35. 5, and especially 25. 9. 4: "monuit, irent *nec* quemquam . . . . paterentur *et* . . . . essent *neu* . . . . facerent," and 26. 34. 7: "iusserunt ita ut nemo . . . . esset . . . . *neve* quis . . . . manerent."

2. *Ut . . . . neque,* the abnormal form in a final sentence, found not at all in Sallust, six times in Cicero, and but twice in Caesar, was used more freely first by Livy, i. e., *ut . . . . neque* final, in Nepos 0 per cent., in Caesar 15.4 per cent., in Cicero 19.4 per cent., but in Livy 64 per cent. Draeger II[2], p. 697, cites 8 examples of *ut . . . . nec* in Livy, and comments on Livy's using only the shorter form. Three of these examples should not be counted, as in 1. 2. 4 we have *nec . . . . solum,* in 1. 43. 11 the indic. in later texts, and 4. 4. 11 has *ne . . . . ne . . . . ne.* In final clauses Livy uses *ut . . . . nec* 11 times, but *ut . . . . neque* 5 times, and in consecutive clauses *ut . . . . nec* 6 times, but *ut . . . . neque* 3 times. In the two kinds, *ut . . . . nec* is found 17 times, *ut . . . . neque* 8. In final clauses *ut . . . . neque* (*nec*) . . . . *et,* etc., are found 20 times, but in consecutive clauses 16 times.

[1] *Ut . . . . neve:* Cic. *Imp. Pomp.* 69; *Sest.* 101; *Phil.* 7. 8; *Off.* 3. 6.

[2] Draeger II[2], p. 695, cites two occurrences in Plautus: add *Bacch.* 648, *Trin.* 1145, each = *ut . . . . neu,* and with parataxis, *Merc.* 1021, *Most.* 403; cf. also Sall. *Cat.* 33. 5.

Final

(a) *Ut* . . . . *neque* 3. 44. 5; 7. 31. 9; 30. 12. 14, 37. 3;
32. 26. 18; (b) *ut* . . . . *nec* 3. 52. 11, 58. 5; 5. 30. 8; 6. 27.
7; 10. 20. 4; 24. 3. 14; 27. 20. 12; 31. 21. 13; 39. 10. 8; 40. 9.
5, 28. 5; (c) *ut* . . . . *neque* . . . . *et* 1. 43. 10, 44. 4; (d)
ut . . . . *nec* . . . . *et* 1. 28. 5.

Consecutive

(a) *Ut* . . . . *neque:* 2. 11. 3; 9. 20. 8; 36. 16. 11; (b) *ut*
. . . . *nec* 2. 9. 8; 8. 36. 7; 27. 8. 6; 34. 18. 2, 22. 4; 38. 51.
12; (c) *ut* . . . . *neque* . . . . *et* 26. 48. 3; *ut* . . . . *nec* . . . .
et 5. 51. 1; 10. 20. 7; (d) *ut* . . . . *nec modo* . . . . *sed etiam*
1. 2. 4, and *ut* . . . . *nec* . . . . *modo* . . . . *sed ne* . . . .
quidem, 26. 2. 11.

In all of the above examples two verbs are used, except in 3.
58. 5: "ut . . . . sui misererentur *nec* gentis."

3.   "Ut . . . . *neve* . . . . *neve*," "that . . . . neither . . . .
nor," is extremely rare.   Two of the passages cited by Draeger
II[2], p. 695, Cic. *Sest.* 65, Caes. *B. G.*, are removed from this cate-
gory by the latest texts or by the sense, i. e., *neu* = *et ne*.   Both
Draeger and Schmalz, *Synt.*[3], p. 358, say that this usage is found
but once in Livy, 30. 37. 4 (= *ut*) *neve* . . . . *neve*.   With an
additional *neu*, however, another passage is found, 25. 38. 5:
"Scipiones me ambo . . . . excitant *neu* se *neu* . . . . milites
. . . . *neu* rem publicam patiar inultam."   It is to be noted that
in all the passages that have been cited none is found with *two*
verbs, such a use, according to Bennett *Critique Rec. Subj.*
Theories, p. 29, having never been developed.   I have noticed
but two: Hor. *Sat.* 2. 5. 89: "*neu* desis . . . . *neve* . . . .
abundes," and (with same verb repeated) Sen. *Ep.* 7. 8: "*neve*
similis malis fias . . . . *neve* inimicus multis."

4.   *Ut neque* . . . . *neque:* a formula used much less freely
(15.6 per cent.) in a final sentence than the simple *ut* . . . .
neque (64 per cent.): *Final:* 4. 11. 4; 5. 11. 9; 22. 12. 8; 35. 25.
8; 44. 46. 7 (4. 11. 4; 22. 12. 8 being with two verbs); *Consecu-*
tive, ut nec . . . . *nec:* 2. 21. 4, 26. 5; 5. 6. 8; 41. 20. 2; 43. 3;
10. 18. 6; 21. 14; 26. 1; 21. 12. 1; 23. 4. 5; 25. 36. 5; 26. 36. 11;

28. 4. 3, 12. 4; 33. 32. 10; 45. 25. 4 (= 16); *ut neque* . . . .
neque, 2. 50. 6, 59. 7; 8. 7. 21, 13. 2; 33. 5. 10, 12 (=6); *ut
neque* . . . . *nec* 21. 35. 12; 22. 61. 13; 33. 7. 2 (=3); *ut nec*
. . . . *neque* 22. 28. 14; 40. 9. 4 (=2). All have only one verb,
except 45. 25. 4.

Note also *ut* . . . . *neque* (*ter*) 8. 38. 10; *ut* . . . . *nec*
(*ter*) 34. 38. 7 and *ut* . . . . *nec* (4 times) 43. 10. 3.

5. *Ne* . . . . *neve:* the normal form is found in Livy 31
times:[1] 1. 52. 6; 3. 17. 12, 30. 5; 4. 30. 13; 8. 34. 6; 21. 40. 5;
23. 7. 4; 25. 14. 2; 26. 1. 10; 27. 38. 6; 30. 37. 6; 33. 30. 6;
38. 4. 6, 29. 8; 39. 19. 4; 40. 44. 10; 45. 25. 9 (=17) and *ne
quis* . . . . *neve* 2. 24. 6; 4. 30. 11; 7. 14. 2; 23. 2. 10, 7. 1,
34. 9; 26. 28. 13; 34. 35. 9, 11; 36. 3. 3; 39. 14. 8, 17. 3, 18.
8; 41. 8. 12 (=14). Of the above *ne* . . . . *neve* = 21, *ne* . . . .
neu = 10 (in Caesar *ne* . . . . *neve* = 3, *ne* . . . . *neu* = 10).

6. *Ne* . . . . *neque* is an abnormal form of expression and very
rare. According to the *Antibarbarus*[7] II, p. 133, it is not found in
Cicero, Caesar, or Sallust, but in Nepos. The nearest approach to
an exception in Cicero is *Verr.* 4. 60: "egerit *ne* . . . . fuisse vi-
deatur *neque* se . . . . instruxisse et ornasse," and similarly in *Fin.*
4. 10; in Caesar *B. G.* 7. 75. 1: *ne* . . . . *nec* . . . . *nec*. Nepos,
cited also by Draeger II[2], p. 697, has, however, in the only possible
passage, 4. 4. 6, been changed to *ne* . . . . *neu* in Fleckeisen's edition
(a change already suggested by Zumpt *Lat. Gr.*, § 535). *Ne* . . . .
neque is found, however, in poetry from Plautus and Terence on.
Ne . . . . *nec*, Livy 4. 4. 11, cited by Draeger and by Kühner II,
p. 146, has *ne* . . . . *ne* . . . . *ne* . . . . *ne* in the latest texts.
(In 5. 33. 11 *nec* =*ne* . . . . quidem.) There, therefore, remain
but 4 occurrences of *ne* . . . . *nec* (*neque* not used) in Livy: 3.
21.6; 5. 3. 8; 26. 42. 2; 40. 46. 4.

7. *Ne* . . . . *neu* . . . . *neu*, found only once in Cicero and
twice in Livy, but not with a correlative force, 29. 24. 3: "monet
eum *ne* iura secum *neu* cum p. R. . . . . *neu* fas . . . . fallat;"
34. 1. 3: "tulerat legem . . . . *ne* qua . . . . plus haberet *neu*
vestimento . . . . uteretur *neu* vehiculo . . . . veheretur."

[1] Draeger II[2], p. 695, cites only 4 passages in Plautus and cites *Merc.* 322 for 332.
As a matter of fact he uses *ne* . . . . *neu* 15 times, *ne* . . . . *neve* 7 times, and *neu* with
parataxis *Merc.* 1021; *Most.* 403.

Note also "*ne* . . . . *neu* . . . . *neu* . . . . *neu*" 8. 32. 4;
"*ne* . . . . *neve* . . . . *et ne*" 43. 2. 12; "*ne* . . . . *ne* . . . .
neve" 7. 14. 2; "*ne* . . . . *neve non solum* . . . . *sed etiam ne*"
37. 53. 6; "*ne* Veientium *neu* Sabinorum . . . . esset *et* . . . .
adessent."

8. *Ne* . . . . *nec* . . . . *nec* (*neque* not used by Livy) is
found twice: 2. 32. 10: "conspirasse . . . . *ne* manus . . . . fer-
rent *nec* os acciperet . . . . *nec* dentes conficerent," and 5. 7. 4:
"metum inecit *ne* . . . . *nec* in urbe . . . . *nec* in castris posset."

C.   *NE* . . . . *AUT* . . . . *AUT*

This form of a final clause should also be taken into considera-
tion. According to the *Antibarbarus*[7] II, p. 145, *ne* . . . . *aut*
. . . . *aut* is more frequent than *ut neve* . . . . *neve* or *ne neve*
. . . . *neve*. The reason for this is that *ne* . . . . *aut* . . . .
aut gives the key to the clause, showing its character at the start,
while *ut* . . . . *neve* . . . . *neve* is more artificial.

The results here given show that in Livy *ne aut* . . . . *aut* is
found eight times as often as the other two combined.

a) With two verbs, *ne* (alone): 24. 29. 6; 25. 11. 2; 27. 4. 2;
29. 27. 11; 32. 22. 3; 34. 34. 5; 35. 29. 9; 37. 52. 7, 54. 9; 40.
14. 7; 42. 33. 5 (=11); *ne quis* 24. 9. 10; 38. 38. 16.

b) With two nouns, *ne* (alone): 4. 58. 12; 5. 20. 2; 8. 29. 3;
22. 49. 11; 27. 26. 8, 30. 10; 28. 25. 8 (=7); *ne quid* 30. 12. 20;
necubi 22. 28. 8.

c) With two prepositional phrases 27. 48. 8, and 31. 11. 14.
(Total = 24.)

SUMMARY

Livy's attitude toward the shorter form of these particles is
represented by the following proportions: *neu* by 57.9 per cent.,
seu by 75.2 per cent., *ac* by 63.4 per cent., *nec* (in first two books
of each decade) by 71.5 per cent., and *dein* by 15 per cent.

I. CO-ORDINATE CLAUSES

A. After a *Positive*:

$$
\left\{
\begin{array}{l}
neque \\
nec \\
neu
\end{array}
\right.
\begin{array}{l}
\left\{
\begin{array}{l}
\text{with imperative} = 2 \\
\text{with subjunctive} = 2
\end{array}
\right\} \\
\text{with subjunctive} = 7 \\
\text{with imperative} = 1
\end{array}
\left.
\begin{array}{l}
\\
\end{array}
\right\} = 11 \qquad = 1
$$

B. After a *Negative:*

$ne \dots neve \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{with subjunctive} = 1 \\ \text{with imperative} = 2 \end{array} \right\} = 3$

$ne \dots neu \quad \text{with imperative} = 6 \quad = 6$

II. SUBORDINATE CLAUSES

A. $ut \dots neve = 4 \atop ut \dots neu = 10 \left.\right\} = 14$

$ut \dots neque \text{ (final)} = 5 \atop ut \dots nec \text{ (final)} = 11 \left.\right\} = 16$
$ut \dots neque \text{ (consecutive)} = 3 \atop ut \dots nec \text{ (consecutive)} = 6 \left.\right\} = 9 \left.\right\} = 25$

$ut \dots neque (nec) \dots et, \text{ etc. (final)} = 20$

$ut \dots neque (nec) \dots et, \text{ etc. (consecutive)} = 15$

$ut \, neve \dots neve = 1$

$ut \, neque \dots neque \text{ (final)} = 2 \atop ut \, nec \dots nec \text{ (final)} = 3 \left.\right\} = 5$

$ut \, neque \dots neque \text{ (consecutive)} = 6 \atop ut \, nec \dots nec \text{ (consecutive)} = 16 \atop ut \, neque \dots nec \text{ (consecutive)} = 3 \atop ut \, nec \dots neque \text{ (consecutive)} = 2 \left.\right\} = 27$

B. $ne \dots neve = 21 \atop ne \dots neu = 10 \left.\right\} = 31$

$ne \dots neve \dots neve = 0$

$ne \dots neu \dots neu = 2$

$ne \dots neque = 0$

$ne \dots nec = 4$

$ne \dots neque \dots neque = 0$

$ne \dots nec \dots nec = 2$

$ne \dots aut \dots aut = 24$

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK